



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to be called *bread*. In fact, we give names to things solely in reference to their sensible qualities, and not in reference to those "substances" of which we can know nothing. If every "substance" in the universe were annihilated, and if the sensible qualities still remained; if things looked the same and felt the same and tasted the same, we should never miss the loss of these substances, and we should give to every object the same name as before.

If it were really the case that what had been the Lord's body assumes all the sensible appearances of bread, the proper way of describing the change would be, *not* that bread had become the body of the Lord, but that the body of the Lord had become bread. To employ an illustration used in a former number, when Moses threw down his rod, and it assumed the appearance and properties of a serpent, we describe the change by saying that Moses' rod became a serpent. It might have retained still the *substance* of Moses' rod, for all we know to the contrary, but, when once it possessed the appearance and properties of a serpent, we give it the name of a serpent, since our only definition of a serpent is an animal that possesses "certain appearances and certain properties." In like manner that which possesses the appearance and properties of bread is entitled to the name of bread, and it is a *contradiction in terms* to assert that while it possesses the qualities of bread it is bread no longer. We shall not continue this philosophical discussion, of which our readers may well weary; but we propose in another article to show that the Scriptures and the Fathers know nothing of these modern subtleties, but that they freely apply to the elements after consecration the terms bread and wine. And we mean to show also how the abuse of language committed by the scholastic divines has led to real and grave errors.

IMAGE WORSHIP IN SCRIPTURE.

In our last number we showed from the writings of the early fathers that the worship of images was not allowed in the early Church. In connection with that article, we will show what the teaching of Scripture is about worship of images, that our readers may see where the early fathers learned their opinion and practice.

We should like our readers to understand clearly what the exact difference is between Protestants and Roman Catholics respecting the worship of images, in order that they might judge which side is supported by Scripture. But here we are in a great difficulty. We can say that all Protestants hold that we are only to worship the persons of the Holy Trinity, and that we are not to use any image in worshipping the Trinity. But we cannot tell with equal distinctness what the doctrine of the Church of Rome is about the worship of images, because the Church of Rome has no settled doctrine about how images may be used in worship. Roman Catholics must form their own notion of that, without infallible direction. Infallibility has *not* undertaken to preserve men from committing idolatry.

One party in the Church of Rome holds that we are only to worship *before* the image, but that it is idolatry to give to the image itself the worship due to what the image represents.

Another party says that we are to give to the image the same worship which is due to what is represented by the image, and that it is heresy to deny this.

Thus one party calls the other idolators; and that party calls the first heretics.

The Council of Trent did not dare to decide between these parties. It could only say that "due veneration" was to be given to images, but durst not decide what veneration was due. It is still lawful for bishops and priests in the Church of Rome to teach, as they have formerly taught, that the same worship which is due to Christ himself is to be given to the image of Christ. Those Roman Catholics who think that this is idolatry must admit that the Church of Rome has silently allowed bishops and priests to teach this idolatry, and has not censured or forbidden them.

We cannot, therefore, state exactly what the doctrine of the Church of Rome is about the worship due to images. If any of our Roman Catholic correspondents can, we shall be very glad to publish it. We can only say that the Church of Rome *allows* the use of images in some way in the worship of God and of Jesus Christ, and *does not forbid* the worship due to God and to Christ being given to their images; while Protestants say it is forbidden to use images at all in the worship of God.

We have some striking instances in Scripture of images having been used in the worship of the true God, and in every case such worship has been treated as idolatry.

The first case is that of the golden calf, which Aaron and the Israelites made. It is clear that Aaron and the people intended to worship the true God by means of that image; yet this worship was treated as idolatry, and punished by God. We take the account from the 32nd chapter of Exodus in the Douay Bible.

Verse 1. "And the people, seeing that Moses delayed to come down from the Mount, gathering together against Aaron, said: Arise, make us gods that may go before us; for as to this Moses, the man that brought us out of the land of Egypt, we know not what has befallen him."

Observe, that the words "gods" in the Hebrew is a word never simply applied to the true God, but only to subordinate gods, or to idols, or to images, or to rulers.*

Then Aaron made the golden calf. (Verses 2-4.) (The same observation applies to the words, "these are thy gods.")

Verse 5. "And when Aaron saw this, he built an altar before it, and made proclamation by a crier's voice, saying: To-morrow is the solemnity of the Lord."

Observe, here, that the word "Lord" is "Jehovah" in the Hebrew. It is clear, therefore, that the Israelites did not mean to forsake the worship of Jehovah: they still meant to worship Him, and Him only; but they meant to worship Him *before* the golden calf, and by means of it. The Israelites and Aaron were not so stupid as to think that it was the figure of a calf which they had made that day which had brought them out of Egypt some months before. They meant it for an image of the true God, who had brought them out. They did not want to serve any other God but Jehovah; but whereas they thought they had lost Moses, the man who used to speak to them from God, they now wanted to have some visible representation of that same God. In fact, they only wanted to worship the true God by means of this image; yet this was punished as idolatry; for this Moses broke the tables of the covenant which God had given (verse 19); and for this "the Lord struck the people for the guilt, on occasion of the calf which Aaron had made." (Verse 35.)

In verse 8, and in some other places of Scripture, it is said they worshipped the calf; but this does not mean that it was their intention to worship the calf as being itself God. It is clear they meant to worship Jehovah *before* the calf. But the Scripture calls this "worshipping the calf;" and justly so, because God would not have that worship; He left it to the calf before which it was offered. Thus, David says, "They made also a calf in Horeb; and they adored the graven thing." But it follows in the next verse, "They changed their glory into the likeness of a calf that eateth grass." Where it is evident that they meant the calf for a representation of God. (Psal. cv., v. 19, 20, Douay Bible; Ps. cvi., Protestant version.)

In like manner, St. Stephen said in his speech in the 7th chapter of the Acts (v. 41, 42), "They made a calf in those days, and offered sacrifice to the idol, and rejoiced in the works of their own hands. And God turned and gave them up to worship the host of Heaven;" that is, the sun, and the moon, and the stars. It is evident that St. Stephen meant in those two verses that *because* they committed a lesser sin of idolatry, God gave them up to fall into a greater sin of idolatry; which can only mean that because they worshipped the true God by an image, God gave them up to worship things which were not God, such as the sun, the moon, and the stars.

It is clear that the Israelites meant the golden calf for a representation or similitude of the true God; and it is clear that this was directly against the second commandment, even as it is translated in the Douay Bible, "Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing, nor the likeness of anything that is in heaven." (Exodus xx., 4.)

And that the commandment was meant to prevent their making any image of the true God, is clear from what Moses impressed on them when, in the 4th chapter of Deuteronomy, he reminded them over again of what took place when God gave them the commandments on Mount Sinai—"Keep, therefore, your souls carefully. You saw not any similitude in the day that the Lord God spoke to you in Horeb from the midst of the fire; lest, perhaps, being deceived, you might make to you a graven similitude or image"—v. 15, 16. Where it is plain that God was careful to show them no visible form of Himself, for fear they should attempt to make an image of Him; and, therefore, Moses warned them to "keep their own souls" from making such an image.

How clear it is that this commandment is against worshipping the true God by means of an image may be understood by what has been said of this commandment by Vasquez, the Jesuit, one of the most famous authors that the Church of Rome has produced: he says—"Since that prohibition of the law of Moses was a positive and ceremonial law, it ought to cease in the time of the Gospel; and that which otherwise was lawful and honest by natural law—viz., that we should depict images, and use them even for adoration, ought to have place in the Gospel law!" which is as much as to say, that since the Church of Rome will not keep the law of God about images, we must consider the law of God as repealed.

Our next case is the idol of Michas, or Michal. (Judges xvii., Douay Bible, verse 3.) A mother said to her son, "I have consecrated and vowed this silver to the Lord, that my son may receive it at my hand, and make a graven and a molten God" (or thing). Here it was to Jehovah, the true God, that the image was consecrated; and it was the Lord that was worshipped and inquired of *before* this image (chap. xviii., 5, 6), and yet it is called "the idol of Michas." (Verse 31.)

Again, where Jeroboam made two golden calves, and used the very words the Israelites used of Aaron's calf, "Behold thy Gods, O Israel, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt," it is clear that Jeroboam did not mean that the people should forsake the worship of the true God, Jehovah, but only that they should worship Him before

these calves, and not in Jerusalem (3 Kings xii., 27, 28, Douay Bible; 1 Kings, Protestant Bible); and yet these images were called "strange gods." (Chap. xiv., 9.)

And of Ahab it is said that he "did evil in the sight of the Lord above all that were before him. Nor was it enough for him to walk in the sins of Jeroboam, the son of Nabat, but he also took to wife Jezebel, daughter of Ethbaal, King of the Sidonians; and he went and served Baal and adored him." (Chap. xvi., 30, 31.) Here the worship of a false God is spoken of as exceeding in wickedness the sin of Jeroboam, which proves that Jeroboam did not worship a false god, but only worshipped the true God by an image, and yet Jeroboam was punished for idolatry.

And Jehu, too, was zealous for the Lord, Jehovah (4 Kings, x. 16. Douay Bible. 2 Kings, Protestant Bible), and destroyed the worship of false gods (verse 28): "Yet he departed not from the sins of Jeroboam, the son of Nabat, who made Israel to sin; nor did he forsake the golden calves" (v. 29). So, it is clear that Jehu considered these calves as images to be used in the worship of the true God, Jehovah; and yet for this very reason it is said of him, that "Jehu took no heed to walk in the law of the Lord God of Israel, with all his heart" (v. 31); and for this sin of worshipping the true God, by means of an image, "the Lord began to be weary of Israel" (v. 32).

In the New Testament, St. Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans, thus convicts the wisest of the heathens of idolatry: "Because that, when they knew God, they have not glorified Him as God, or given thanks; but became vain in their thoughts, and their foolish heart was darkened. For, professing themselves to be wise, they became fools. And they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of the image of a corruptible man." (Rom. i., 21-23.) And mark the punishment: "Wherefore, God gave them up to the desires of their hearts, unto uncleanness, to dishonour their own bodies among themselves" (v. 24).

The wisest of the heathen *did* know that there was only one true, invisible, spiritual God; but they worshipped Him under the image of a man; and for that God gave them up to the vilest of sins.

Our readers may now understand why the early fathers were so strenuous against the use of images in the worship of the true God; and where they learned to abhor it as they did.

And then they may learn to consider more carefully the excuses made in the Church of Rome for the use of images in worship now.

When Roman Catholics say that they do not worship the images of God or of Christ, but that they only worship God or Christ as represented by the image, they do but prove themselves guilty of the sin of Aaron and the Israelites, for which the Tables from God's own hand were broken; of the sin of Jeroboam, for which his house was cut off from the earth; of the sin of Jehu, for which the Lord began to be weary of Israel; of the sin of the wisest of the heathens, for which God gave them up to the vilest abominations.

But when other Roman Catholics have declared that they do worship the image of Christ itself with that very worship which is due to Christ himself, they fall into a still lower degree of idolatry.

And when the Church of Rome allows this last and lowest idolatry to be preached by bishops and by priests, and never ventures to censure or forbid it, she is, at least, guilty of conniving at idolatry. We ask our Roman Catholic correspondents if they are not horrified at this? Let them come forward and disprove it if they can, before we proceed to prove it.

God has a right to be worshipped by the creatures He has made, in whatever way He himself may choose. His creatures have no right to tell Him that He shall take whatever worship they may choose to give. God will not accept a worship which He has forbidden. If alleged infallibility cannot teach men what worship God will accept, and what He will reject, then "let every man deliver his own soul."

THE SEE OF ST. PETER.—No. III.

HAVING in our former articles on this subject shown how little historical ground there is for holding that St. Peter ever was Bishop of Rome, it remains to be considered whether, in the absence of direct historical evidence, there exists any sufficient indirect evidence from which it can safely be implied that he was such Bishop.

Such a conclusion is not unfrequently attempted to be drawn by the supporters of Roman supremacy from certain expressions to be found in the writings of the fathers, such as calling the Bishops of Rome "successors of the Apostles," "successors of St. Peter," possessors of the "Apostolic See," the "seat or chair of St. Peter," and the like.

We have shown in our former articles that Rome was not *exclusively* considered as the Apostolic See by the primitive Church, but that the cities of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria were also considered, at least down to the 7th century, as of co-equal dignity and power with Rome. This is a matter of great importance to be remembered when considering the weight and meaning of such passages as we have just alluded to.

We have now to add, that many other Bishops than

* As in Gen. iii. 5; xxxi. 30; xxxv. 2. Exodus xxii. 28. 1 Sam. xviii. 12. 1 Kings xii. 28. Nehemiah ix. 18. See Trommli Concordantie—Vol. I., 746.

† Cum fuerit juris positivum et ceremoniale illa legis Moysæ prohibito, tempore legis evangelicæ debuit cessare; atque id, quod alias jure naturali licitum et honestum est, ut imagines depingere, et illis etiam uti ad adorationem, in lege evangelicâ locum habere debet." Vasquez, lib. 2., de adorat. disput. 4., cap. 4., sec. 84, p. 84, Compluti. 1594.

even those of Jerusalem, Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch were spoken of by primitive writers as having "apostolical sees," or as being "successors of the Apostles."

Thus Tertullian, in the 3rd century, speaks of *Corinth, Thessalonica, Philippi, and Ephesus* as "apostolical sees," because St. Paul founded them and supplied them with pastors; though St. Paul was never deemed Bishop of any of those places, and such Bishops did not, therefore, obtain their sees, properly speaking, by way of succession, but by the equally intelligible one of apostolical ordination, which we have already seen was the mode in which both Linus and Clement were successively appointed Bishops of Rome during the Apostles' lives, in subordination to them, and not as their successors—just, in fact, as a Dictator of Rome might create inferior magistrates, who derived from him, but not as his successors.

Thus he also enumerates *Smyrna* among the apostolical sees,^b because *Polyarp* was settled there by St. John.

What real support, therefore, can the doctrine of Roman supremacy derive from passages speaking of its Bishops as successors of the Apostles, or as holding an *Apostolic See*, where the same titles were also given to so many other places besides the city of Rome?

The same title of *Apostolical* was also even sometimes given to Churches which could trace no direct apostolic origin, as we also find from Tertullian, where he speaks of "those Churches which, though they do not produce any of the Apostles or apostolical men for their author, yet, agreeing in the same faith, are no less, from the consanguinity of their doctrine, reputed *Apostolical*."

And thus, after a while, all Bishops came to be held "successors of the Apostles," as all alike holding apostolical doctrines, and alike entrusted with the same divinely instituted powers of instructing, dispensing the sacraments, ruling, and exercising discipline, and, therefore, were all deemed equal as to their office; though one might differ from another in splendour, wealth, reputation, or extent of jurisdiction, just as one king may surpass another in extent of territory, though all kings are equal in office, and independent of one another.

St. Jerome, in his epistle to Evangelus (or Evagrius), distinctly asserts this equality:—

"Wherever a Bishop be, whether at Rome or at Eugubium, at Constantinople or at Rhegium, at Alexandria or at Thénis, he is of the same worth, and of the same priesthood. The force of wealth and lowness of poverty doth not render a Bishop more high or more low; for that all of them are successors of the Apostles."^a

So St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, and Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea, his contemporary, asserted themselves to be "successors of the Apostles," though it is not pretended that any of the Apostles were ever in person either at Carthage or Cæsarea.

Synods, also, even so late as the 9th century, spoke of all Bishops as "Vicars of Christ" and "successors of the Apostles."

Thus, the Synod of Compeigne, A.D. 833, under Pope Gregory IV.—"It is convenient that all Christians should know what kind of office that of bishop is—who, it is plain, are the Vicars of Christ and keep the keys of the kingdom of heaven."

So the Synod of Melun, under Pope Sergius II., A.D. 845—"And though all of us unworthy, yet are 'the Vicars of Christ and successors of his Apostles.'"

It would be easy to multiply quotations from early writers to the same effect, but we prefer giving references to one or two more modern Roman Catholic writers of eminence, who sum up the matter as follows.

^a "Percurrere Ecclesias Apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc Cathedra Apostolorum suis locis præsentant, apud quas ipsæ authenticè litterarum eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem, et representantes faciem uniuscujusque. Proxima est tibi Achala? habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedonia, habes Philippum, habes Thessalonicensis. Si petes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiam adiacas, habes Romanam, unde nobis quoque auctoritas præsto est."—Tertullian de Præscriptione Hæreticorum, No. 36, p. 215. Rigalt. Ed. Paris, 1634.

^b "Hoc enim modum Ecclesiæ Apostolicæ census suos deferunt; sicut Synagoga Ecclesiæ Polycarpum ab Ioanne conlocatum refert: sicut Romanorum, Clementem a Petro ordinatum idem, perinde utque et ceteras exhibent quos ab Apostolis in Episcopatum constitutos Apostolici semel tradidisse habent."—*Ibid.*, No. 32, p. 243. (See also Irenæus contra hæreses, lib. 3, c. 3, p. 176, 7. Ben. Ed. Paris, 1710. Grabe's Ed., p. 204, 4. Oxon, 1702.)

^c "Ad hanc itaque formam probantur ab illis Ecclesiis, quæ licet nullam ex Apostolis, vel Apostolicis, auctoritatem sumunt præferant, et multo posteriores, quæ denique quotidie instituntur, tamen in eadem fide constanter, non minus Apostolicæ deputantur, pro consanguinitate doctrinæ."—Tertull. ut supra, No. 32, p. 243.

^d "Nec aliter Romanæ urbis ecclesiæ, altera totius orbis existimanda est. Et Gallia, et Britannia, et Africa, et Persia, et Oriens, et India, et omnes barbaræ nationes, unum Christum adorant; unam observant regulam veritatis. Si auctoritas quæritur, orbis major est urbe. Ubiqueque fuerit Episcopus, sive Romæ, sive Taniis, ejusdem meriti, ejusdem est et sacerdotii. Potentia divitiarum, et paupertatis humilitas, vel sublimiorum vel infirmiorum Episcopum non facit. Ceterum omnes Apostolorum successores sunt."—Hieron. ad Evangelium (aut Evagrius) Epis. 101 or 85, vol. iv., part 2, p. 803. Ben. Ed., Paris, 1716.

^e "Unitatem a Domino et per Apostolos nobis successoribus traditam."—Cyprian. Epis. 42, p. 57; Ben. Ed., Paris, 1738. "Adversari nostri qui Apostolis successoribus."—Firmilian. in Cyprian. Ep. 76; Idem, p. 148.

^f "Omnes in Christiana religione constituti scire convenit, qualem ministerium Episcoporum—quos constat esse Vicarios Christi, et clarioris Regni Cælestium, &c."—Syn. Compend., A.D. 833. Conc. Gener. apud Biniom tom. iii., p. 1, p. 573. Conc. Agrip., 1608. Labbe and Cos., tom. vii., p. 168.

^g "Nos omnes licet indigni, Christi tamen Vicarii, et Apostolorum ipsius successores."—Syll. Meldense, A.D. 845 (apud Bin., tom. iii., p. 1, p. 607). Labbe and Cos., vol. 7, p. 1818.

Cardinal de Cusa tells us that "all Bishops are beyond denial to be considered successors of St. Peter, though the Roman Pontiff is principally such successor."^a

Father Dupin, in his work on the discipline of the Ancient Church, also says, that "all Bishops of apostolical Churches may be called successors of the particular Apostles by whom those Churches were founded; and in general, that all Bishops are held to be successors of all the Apostles."^b

We would now make a few observations on another phrase not unfrequently met with in the old ecclesiastical writings, and which unexplained, is ambiguous, and likely to mislead an unwary reader. St. Cyprian (A.D. 250), Bishop of Carthage, speaks of the Church of Rome as "Peter's Chair," and this has not unfrequently been urged as a clear proof that St. Peter was the first bishop of Rome. Nothing, however, can be more fallacious than such reasoning. Cyprian, it is plain, was here alluding, not to the Church of Rome having a material chair of wood and ivory, which had once belonged to St. Peter (such as that described by Cardinal Wiseman in his Essays, vol. iii., p. 303, which he says is preserved in a shrine of gilt bronze in the Church of St. Peter at Rome, and on which are engraved, as he admits, the "Labours of Hercules"), but merely to the authority and doctrine of the Apostle, which were, as we shall now proceed to show, often figuratively described by the words "seat," "chair," or "throne."

St. Jerome tells us distinctly that in all such expressions the word "chair" means doctrine, or authority to teach, "Per Cathedram Doctrinam debemus accipere."—Commentary on Matthew, chap. xxiii.^c

"Peter's chair, or the episcopal seat," says Father Dupin in his Commentary on Optatus, "is the authority of ruling the laity by the power of the priesthood." Just as Father Calmet says, commenting on Matthew xxiii.—"By the chair of Moses is here signified his doctrine or his authority;" and again, in his "Dictionary of the Bible,"—"the chair of Moses expresses the authority of the doctors of the law and their office of teaching." "Sitting in Moses' seat" is exercising the authority of Moses. St. Augustine says, "the chair of Moses was a figure of the chair of Christ."^d

The terms, sedes, cathedra, ὁθρονος, seat, or chair, or throne, were, in fact, the ordinary appellation of episcopal jurisdiction, and the episcopal authority on Christian monuments is commonly symbolized by a throne or chair.^e

To conclude, therefore, from Cyprian having spoken of "Peter's chair" that the Church of Carthage (of which St. Cyprian was bishop, about A.D. 250) considered that any peculiar connection existed between Peter and the Church at Rome, which did not apply to other Churches which were equally founded by the Apostle, such as Antioch and Alexandria, would be to overlook altogether the symbolical and figurative sense in which this expression was commonly used both by Jews and Christians.

The same remark will of course hold good of all other writers using similar language.

We think we need say no more to satisfy any candid inquirer (in the absence of satisfactory historical evidence that St. Peter was ever Bishop of Rome, in that accurate and local sense which alone could support the claims of the Bishops of that Church to be considered exclusively as his successors) that there is nothing in the class of passages to which we have referred, and which are often cited as establishing the claim, at least indirectly and by implication, that can be safely relied on as a sufficient proof of this last and indispensable link in the chain, which, as by adamant power, is supposed to hold up the gigantic structure of the Papal supremacy.

^a "Licet Romanus pontifex, principaliter successor sit S. Petri, tamen non possumus negare omnes Episcopos esse ejusdem successores."—De concord. Cath. lib. ii., c. 13, p. 728; erroneously printed 782. Nicol. de Cusa Card., Opera, Basle, 1665.

^b "Ex æquo Ecclesiæ apostolicæ Episcopi, dicantur eorum apostolorum à quibus Ecclesiæ sunt fundatæ successores: imo omnes Episcopi Apostolorum omnium successores esse perhibentur."—Dupin, de ant. Eccl. discipl. Dissert. iv., c. 1, s. 3, p. 318. Londini, 1691.

^c The Cardinal here takes great pains to disprove the alleged calumny of Lady Morgan in her work on Italy, (vol. ii., p. 283, note) that this was the chair which the sacrilegious curiosity of the French discovered to have on it the Arabic inscription, "There is but one God, and Mahomet is his prophet," and asserts that this applied not to the chair in St. Peter's, at Rome, but to the rival chair in St. Peter's at Venice, said to have been given by the Emperor Michael to the Doge Peter Grandoulus, in 1810, but which the learned, he says, have proved to have been constructed in the 8th century. We think it signifies but little whether such chairs are embellished with the pagan fable of the labours of Hercules, or the blasphemous inventions of the impostor Mahomet. That either of them ever belonged to St. Peter is equally destitute of anything deserving of the name of proof.

^d S. Hieron. Opera, tom. iv., p. 108. Lib. iv., Ben. Ed. Paris, 1706. "Cathedra sedes episcopalis est auctoritas suprema regenda plebis vi sacerdotii."—S. Optat. de schismate Donatistarum, Lib. i., c. 10, note 5 [A. Cathedra Petri], p. 10. Antw., 1702.

^e "Moyse Cathedra significat hic illius instituta, vel auctoritatem."—August. Calmet. Commentaria Literalia, tom. vii., p. 219. August. Vind. 1760. Paris ed. in French.—1726, tom. vii., p. 201.

^f La Chaire de Moïse. Sur laquelle étoient assis les Scribes et les Pharisiens, marque l'autorité des Docteurs de la loi, et la fonction d'enseigner qu'on leur a déferée, ou qu'ils se sont arrogée. Le Seigneur veut qu'on les écoute et qu'on les respecte; mais il ne veut pas qu'on imite leur conduite."—Calmet's Dict. Histor. de la Bible. Supplém. tom. iii. Paris, 1778. Title Clavier, p. 158.

^g St. Aug. Opera, tom. ix. Ben. ed. p. 239, Contra litteras Petilian. Lib. ii. cap. lxi. c.—Cathedra Moysi Christi cathedram figurabat.—"Præcepit Dominus descri cathedram Moysi, in quo tuque figuratur auctoritas."

^h See Suicer, Thes. Eccl.—Amst., 1728—tom. i., p. 1410; and examples in Aringhi Roma Subterranea—Rome, 1651—tom. ii., pp. 55, 668; and Mainachi Orig. et. Antiq. Christ., tom. v.—Rome, 1850—p. 480.

Before proceeding, however, to our next step, we must be allowed to observe, that even if it could be clearly proved that St. Peter was appointed, by divine command, local Bishop of Rome, and that he was given by the same divine authority a primacy of jurisdiction over all other Bishops of the Church of Christ, it would still require proof that such powers were transmissible to his successors in the Roman See, and were not confined to his own person, or attached to his apostolical character. It is surely evident enough that our Lord might have thought it needful to the first establishment of the infant Church to have invested St. Peter personally with peculiar powers, which, nevertheless, it would be needless to continue in after ages, just as the gifts of direct inspiration, speaking with tongues, prophesying and working miraculous cures, which were necessary to enable the Apostles in general to lay the first foundations of a new religion, were deemed by our Lord unnecessary to be transmitted to any of those who succeeded them in the propagation of the Christian faith. It cannot, therefore, be assumed as self-evident that the powers of St. Peter were necessarily transmitted to his successors, even if it were as clearly established, as it is not, that he had lived and died local Bishop of Rome, and had, while he lived, the exclusive power over and care of all the Churches.

Whether St. Peter really had such an exclusive power, or whether it was not rather St. Paul, who had "the care of all the Churches," we must reserve for consideration in our future numbers.

Before closing our present article, however, we cannot refrain from noticing the not very creditable artifice resorted to by some leading Roman Catholic controversialists of the present day, who attempt to conceal altogether the distinctions to which we have referred, in a way certain to mislead those who will not take the trouble to test the truth and accuracy of their assertions, by reference to the testimony to which they, in general terms, appeal with all the confidence of superior learning and conscious truth.

Take, for example, the following passage from the Lectures of Cardinal Wiseman:—

"I presume," says he, "it will not be necessary to enter into any argument to show that St. Peter was the first Bishop of Rome. The monuments which yet exist in every part of it, and the testimony of ecclesiastical writers from the oldest times, put the fact above all doubt; and it is only sufficient to say, that authors of the highest literary eminence, and remarkable for their opposition to the supremacy of the Roman See, such as Cave, Pearson, Ussher, Young, and Blondel, have both acknowledged and supported it."

We have already shown how far it is from the truth to assert that "the testimony of ecclesiastical writers from the earliest times has put the fact above all doubt." Let us now see whether the appeal to the eminent Protestant writers, Cave, Pearson, Ussher, Young, and Blondel, is not equally uncandid and destitute of any solid foundation.

The learned and discriminating Dr. Cave thus sums up his disquisition on the subject—"It may not undeservedly be doubted whether, properly speaking, Peter ought to be called Bishop of Rome. In a laxer sense, indeed, he may, inasmuch as he founded that Church, and rendered it illustrious by his martyrdom. . . . But the nature of the apostolic office hardly allows that he could have been attached to the See of Rome as its peculiar Bishop, and no records of primitive antiquity tell us that he was."

And yet, Cardinal Wiseman asserts that Dr. Cave has acknowledged and supported his unqualified assertion that St. Peter was the first Bishop of Rome! He might just as well have stated that the writer of the present article does so while contending for the very contrary.

The only pretence for asserting that Bishop Pearson admits that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome is a passage in which, after citing the passages from Irenæus and Epiphanius, which we have already given in our first article, p. 86, col. 2, he observes on the latter thus, "Here he (Epiphanius) plainly teaches that Paul, no less than Peter, was both Apostle and Bishop, and derives the succession of the Roman Bishops from Paul no less than from Peter. It is true, therefore, that the ancient Greek fathers considered both Peter and Paul to be Bishops of Rome."^a

That Bishop Pearson was here speaking of the title of Bishop in that laxer sense in which the Apostles were Bishops everywhere, is evident; and, if anything were wanting to show that he did not mean that either St. Peter or St. Paul were locally Bishops of Rome, it might be found in this, that in page 168 of the same volume he distinctly states that "Linus, during the lifetime of the Apostles Peter and Paul, was constituted its Bishop," and refers to Irenæus in proof of it.^b

As to Archbishop Ussher, we are at a loss to conceive what colour Dr. Wiseman could have discovered in his

^a Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church.—Lect. viii., p. 278. London: 1836.

^b "Ut hinc disertat unicum finem tandem faciamus; non immerito dubitari potest an propriè loquendo, Petrus Romæ Episcopus dici debeat. Laxiori quidem sensu Romanum Episcopum dici posse, quatenus hujus ecclesiæ fundamenta posuit, eamque martyrio suo illustravit. necnon opinor fatebuntur omnes tam veteres, quam recentiores—Romanæ vero Cathedræ tanquam peculiarem Episcopum officium esse, egrè patitur numeris Apostolicis ratio; nec uia non docent primæ vetustatis monumenta."—Hist. Literar., vol. ii., c. 5., s. 2, p. 163.

^c Pearson. Opera Post., chap. vi., Dissert. I., page 29. Lond., 1688. "Cum Petrus et Paulus fundarent ecclesiæ, hoc est apostolis illis adhuc superstitibus, Linus Romæ episcopus constituitur, ut docet Irenæus."—Pearson, Opera. Posth., Diss. ii., c. 5., s. 2, p. 163.

works to sanction such an assertion. We, at least, have been wholly unable to find anything in them capable of being perverted to such a meaning, and think it really impossible that Ussher could ever have written any such thing. On the contrary, in his *Treatise on the origin of Bishops and Metropolitans*, alluding to those passages in Irenæus in which he speaks of "the successions of Bishops, unto whom the Apostles committed the charge of the Church in every place," he proceeds thus: "For proof whereof he bringeth in the succession of the Bishop of Rome from Linus (unto whom the blessed Apostles committed the episcopacy)" &c., &c., which shows plainly that Archbishop Ussher considered Linus, and not St. Peter, as the first Bishop of Rome. If, however, any of our Roman Catholic readers are able to find any passage in Ussher's works which could justify such an assertion, we think they owe it to the fair fame of Cardinal Wiseman without delay to publish it, which we shall readily do in our pages, if furnished with it.

Dr. Wiseman's next authority is Young, who was librarian to Charles I., and better known by his Latinized name of Patricius Junius. He edited the first Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians; and we suppose that the passage to which Cardinal Wiseman would refer is a note to page 8, in that work, on the words *ἐν τῇ τήν τῆς ὁδοῦς*, in which he speaks of "the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome, under Nero," which, we need scarcely observe, is a perfectly different proposition from the one of which we are treating, and might be conceded in the fullest manner, without affording the slightest cause for asserting that either of them was the Bishop of that See. Why might not Apostles suffer martyrdom as well as Bishops? and if it could be proved that they suffered martyrdom at Jerusalem, it would assuredly no more prove that they were Bishops of Jerusalem than the Crucifixion of our Blessed Saviour himself there would establish that He was its first Bishop.

The only other writer referred to is Blondel, the leader of the French Protestants in the 17th century, who succeeded Vossius in his professorship, and confuted the celebrated Cardinal du Perron.

We can scarcely repress our astonishment at the coolness (we had well nigh said effrontery) with which his name has been invoked in aid of such a statement.

What will our readers think of the learning or the candour of Cardinal Wiseman, when we give them the actual words of Blondel on this subject?

His words are these: "The assignment of the Bishopric of Rome to St. Peter in particular is contradicted by St. Irenæus, Eusebius, Epiphanius, and others, who commence their reckoning of the Bishops of Rome from the Apostles Peter and Paul, whom they formally except from the catalogue; showing that, properly speaking, neither Peter nor Paul were Bishops of Rome; and that if the episcopal office is taken in a wider signification, they both of them equally exercised it there."

So much for Cardinal Wiseman's attempt to carry this difficult pass by a feint. To have referred to such writers as a reason why it was "unnecessary to enter into any argument to show that St. Peter was the first Bishop of Rome" tends, we think, as little to the honour of the cause he was advocating, as to the credit of the audience he was addressing. The latter may have been deluded, but we cannot help thinking a cause must be hopeless which can only be defended by such unworthy artifices.

Having said thus much upon the question whether there is any satisfactory proof that St. Peter ever was Bishop of Rome, in that accurate and peculiar sense in which alone it can be of any service to the cause of Rome, we purpose proceeding in our next number to consider the remaining questions, which we referred to in a former article, as equally indispensable to establish the claims of the Roman supremacy.

We would, however, guard our readers against supposing that we have given them all the arguments in our power against the assertion that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome. We could easily add many others from the admirable treatise of the celebrated Dr. Isaac Barrow on Cambridge on the Pope's Supremacy, one of the most elaborate and searching works in the English language, and which, we believe, has never been attempted to be confuted by any Roman Catholic writer.

We think, however, we have said enough to show any candid inquirer, that the testimony of learned men, Roman Catholic as well as Protestant, is opposed to the alleged historical fact we have been discussing—and, therefore, that unless it be a matter to be simply taken for granted, without any proof, the onus of proof eminently lies on those who assert the affirmative of the proposition, that St. Peter was the first Bishop of Rome, and that his powers, whatever they were as such, upon his death devolved upon his successors in that Bishoprick.

* See the 7th vol. of Archbishop Ussher's works by Dr. Erlington, p. 62 and 81.

* "Successiones episcoporum, quibus illi (apostoli) eam quæ in unoquoque loco est ecclesiæ tradiderunt."—Irenæus, lib. 4., Contra Hæreses, c. 33, op. p. 272. Ben. Ed.

* "Petrum et Paulum Romæ sub Nerone martyrio vitam finisse, notius est quam ut in dubium vocetur. De tempore autem opinio duplici est, &c.—Clementis Epist. ad Corinthios Annot. in p. 8. Oxon. 1633.

* "L'a-signation de l'Épiscopat de Rome à St. Pierre particulièrement est impuée par St. Irenée, Eusèbe, Epiphane &c., qui commencent à compter les Evêques de Rome depuis les Apôtres Pierre et Paul, qu'ils exceptent formellement de leur catalogue, montrant qu'à proprement parler, ni Pierre ni Paul n'ont été Evêques de Rome, et qu'en prenant l'Épiscopat en une signification plus large, il y ont tous deux également exercé l'Épiscopat."—*Traité historique de la Primauté*, Par D. Blondel. Geneva, 1641 p. 648.

THE DUMB VILLAGE.

CHAPTER III.

"THANK you for the comparison," said the other. "You might mend your manners, as well as your theology. Do you mean to say that Father M. is a rogue, and that I am a fool?"

"Indeed, I do not," replied his opponent. "For I am sure Father M., if left to himself, is an honest as well as an able man; and you are smart enough. But we all know that the screw has been put upon him, and he is, therefore, likely to say some queer things. What I mean is this: 'the doll's house' quite got the better of me. When wonder gets in, wit, they say, gets out; and so my curiosity overcame my judgment. I never reflected on the matter at all, but paid my penny, and walked in; but I came out with less money and more sense. Now, it seems to me that you, Roman Catholics, constantly hear such wonderful things about your religion, that you are prepared to believe anything you hear. The very confidence with which these marvellous things are asserted, instead of leading you to think, makes you wonder; and you believe mainly because you wonder. It is the little boys and the doll's house all out with you. Forbidden to examine into the truth of your religion, and required to take it all upon authority, there is nothing left, when you become a little inquisitive, because Protestants, who want to know what is right, ask you a few questions, but to put you off, in an easy, confident sort of way, with some plausible talk. As much as to say—You Catholics, have plenty of the best reasons for your religion. Whenever they are wanted they will always be forthcoming. But this one is quite enough for these poor foolish heretics, who could not, of course, understand a good argument, if you gave it to them. This sort of thing pleases you. I don't blame you. It's not your fault. You have heard so many fine things of your religion, and so much, which is not true, of ours, it is not surprising, though it is discreditable, you should believe what you so constantly hear. Only don't blame us if, being men, we act like men, and think, since God gave us reason, he meant we should use it. We believe in our faith, because it is true, and do not fear investigation, because we possess proof. You are discouraged from inquiry, because your religion is founded upon assertions which inquiry will disprove. But," he exclaimed with great energy, "the time is coming when you, too, shall cease to be children, and become men. When you 'shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.' You will then find that all those arguments for the truth of your religion which, you are told, exist, will be like money hid in a strong-box, which you conclude to be safe because the lock is untouched, and the dust lies thick upon the lid. Never thinking once that the floor may be cut through from underneath, and the property gone, when you come to look for it."

"That's all fine talk," said the schoolmaster, who could not help, as well as others, feeling impressed by the earnestness of the young man. "But for one who finds so much fault with us for avoiding argument, you seem mighty little inclined to give them yourself. Can't you find a better answer than such nonsense to what Father M. has said?"

"Here is one for you, at all events," said his opponent. "You are my answer."

"I am your answer!" replied the schoolmaster. "You are so grand to-day, I can make nothing of you. Do," said he, winking knowingly, as if he was conscious of saying a smart thing, "if it be not too much trouble to you, come down from the stilts, and let a poor fellow like me understand what you mean. You are quite beyond us."

"Well, then, what I mean to say is this: If Father M.'s argument be a good one, as you say it is, you could not be a Catholic at all. Therefore, as you are one, it must be bad."

"Oh, listen, boys, to the Protestant logic! Mind now what he says. I am to be a bad Catholic because I have a good argument. That's queer, at all events. And so, I suppose, you'll allow, by the same rule, you must be a good Protestant, since, it is quite certain, you have bad arguments. I think that's likely enough, at all events. I won't dispute it."

This sally of the schoolmaster's made them all laugh heartily. It was one of the many quick things which constantly occur during the religious discussions of a people so acute as the Irish peasantry. And there can be no doubt that the enjoyment derived from them has the great advantage of preventing the anger and ill-will which controversy among people of violent passions is apt to produce. The keen relish of a joke, which they possess in a remarkable degree, gives infinite zest to disputes, which serve as fertile occasions of exercising their ingenuity and displaying their wit. Those who have listened to such 'passages of arms' have frequently been surprised by the skill with which a home thrust has been parried in this happy way.

The tables were, however, soon turned. For, as soon as the laugh, in which the Scripture-reader joined as heartily as the others, had subsided, he answered very composedly,

"I said, if your argument was good you could not be a Catholic. For you and I must have continued, as our

ancestors were, heathens. Would not their priests have said to their followers, when the Apostles of our Lord came among them preaching the Gospel, just what your priests say to you? Would they not say just what Father M. says?—'Is not your religion true? If you begin to doubt you will endanger your faith. Have not your fathers always held the same? Consider all the great men who have never questioned what you begin to examine. See the millions who believe as you believe. Can they all be wrong, and you alone right?' The heathen priests might just have stopped their mouths as Father M. stops yours; and so heathenism, if his argument be good, must have continued for ever. We never could have been Christians at all. In point of fact, as you have more than one heathen doctrine in your religion, so you have more than one heathen argument among yours. The Jewish priests, too, might have given just the same reason (had it not been too bad to be thought of) to their poor people, when they wanted to prevent them from listening to our Lord Jesus. The argument would be just as good for them as it is for you. Father M. says—'Is not your religion true?' They would have asked just the same question. He tells you—'If you begin to question you will peril your faith.' So would they. His address to you would exactly suit for them—'Have not your fathers before you always held the same faith with yourselves? Are you better than they? Look to us who are your guides. Do we believe in this new religion which a poor carpenter's son is teaching you? It never existed until to day. Will you set up ignorant fishermen, who know nothing, against us, who are appointed to teach you? Mind what we tell you, and don't mind anybody else. There's your reason, if you must have one at all. Would you have the thistle of Lebanon set itself up against the cedar of Lebanon? Have any of the Scribes and Pharisees believed on him? When they do, it will be time enough for you, but not until then.' I think, therefore, I was right in saying, 'You are my answer; because if the reason you gave be good at all, the Christian religion never could have existed. All would be Jews or heathens.'

The schoolmaster saw the force of the argument. He did not know what to say for a moment to such an unexpected retort. At last he replied briskly—

"Aye, that may be fair enough; but, then, our religion is true, and the heathen is false. This, you must allow, makes all the difference in the world."

"The heathens would have said the same of you. Error has no defence but assertion. Error says, 'I am right.' But truth proves itself to be so. How do you know that you are right?"

"Oh," said he, "that's easily settled. Haven't we the infallible Church to guide us, and that can't err?"

"Just what the leaders of the Jews would have said, too, when they wanted to keep the people from inquiring. 'We are the only Church of God—follow us. God, it is true, gave you reason; but you have as little right to use it in these matters as the weathercock would have to say to the wind which it was made to follow, 'You are not to twist me as you please. I'll turn as I like best myself.' Now, the authority of your Church seems to me like the wind, and you are the weathercocks to follow it."

"Hold hard there," said the schoolmaster, who saw here a good point, and made it. "I'll mend your simile for you, Mr. Scripture-reader. Our Church has an infallible authority, which never varies. That's like the trade winds, which, as you know, always blow in one direction."

"Well answered, at all events," replied his opponent. "You have hit me there, I admit. And if you will only prove the existence of any such authority, as we can of the trade winds, I am content to give up the case, and become one of the weathercocks too. Now, only keep to the point. We know why there must be 'trade winds,' and also where to find them. Do you now prove for me that any infallible authority really exists in your Church, and, above all things, tell me where I am to look for it. For this I never yet could learn from any Roman Catholic I have met."

"That's soon settled," said the other, in no small glee at having at last pushed, as he thought, his adversary into a corner, from whence there was, in his opinion, no escape for him. "Father M. settled that for us the other day. 'Every one,' said he, 'is obliged to follow authority. You can't get on without it. If you are sick you must send for Dr. Finnigan, though perhaps, indeed, some among you (and we all know very well what he meant) would rather send for the quack. If you want law you must go to Counsellor Casey. Would you ask their advice, and then follow your own nonsense? It is just the same in religion. The Church tells you all you want to know. Come to me when you wish to hear what she says. For," said he, and wasn't it a grand thing of him altogether, and where could your clergyman get such an idea out of your Church? 'The Church is like the sun, and the priest is like the moon, which you have heard, my children, gets all the light which it sends to the earth from the sun, and never sends any other. The instruction which your priest gives you is just the doctrine which the Church gives him. So it's quite plain you can never go wrong. While Protestants, with their own poor private judgment to guide them, are just like people who want to see by 'a farthing dip,' when